

## REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

Claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11-15 and 17-21 are allowed.

Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 16 and 22 are rejected.

Claims 23 and 24 are objected to, but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112*

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 22 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1, 6, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,592,235 (“Park”). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a sync signal detector to detect the presence of analog television signal synchronization pulses, and switching circuitry that operates in response to the synchronization pulses being detected. In the example embodiment of Applicant’s Fig. 2, the sync signal detector 250 detects the synchronization pulses, and switching circuitry 260 includes analog television signal rejection filter 240 in the DTV received signal processing path 210 when the sync signal detector detects the presence of analog television signal synchronization pulses within the received signal, i.e., in response to the SELECT signal.

The Examiner alleges that the IF filter/sync detector 53 shown in Fig. 3 of Park anticipates the sync signal detector recited in claim 1, and the multiplexer 9 shown in Fig. 3 of Park anticipates the switching circuit recited in claim 1.

However, Park’s IF filter/sync detector 53 does not *detect the presence of analog television signal synchronization pulses* as recited in claim 1. Instead, Park’s IF filter/sync detector 53 is a “synchronous detector,” not a detector of synchronization pulses. A synchronous detector is merely a demodulator in which the original signal is recovered by multiplying the modulated signal by the output of a synchronous oscillator locked to the carrier. (See article at [http://www.tvms.net/Tech\\_Articles/Synchronous\\_vs\\_Envelope\\_Detection.htm](http://www.tvms.net/Tech_Articles/Synchronous_vs_Envelope_Detection.htm) titled “Synchronous Vs Envelope Detection” submitted with the IDS filed November 6, 2006.) Park’s IF filter/sync detector 53 synchronously detects the IF signal output from tuner 51 by using a

carrier output from sync extractor 54, which extracts the carrier signal (column 5, lines 4-9). In other words, Park's IF filter/sync detector 53 is a synchronous detector, but it does not detect *synchronization pulses* as recited in claim 1. In fact, Park does not seem to mention any type of pulses, much less synchronization pulses.

Moreover, Park does not disclose a switching circuit that operates in response to synchronization pulses being detected. Park's multiplexer 58 operates in response to an output from NTSC interference discriminator 57 (column 5, lines 15-17), but Park does not teach or suggest that the discriminator causes the multiplexer to operate in response to the detection of analog television signal synchronization pulses within the received signal.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Park, nor are claims 6 and 10 which depend from claim 1 and recite additional novel features.

Claim 16 recites detecting analog television synchronization signals. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, Park does not disclose detecting analog television synchronization signals, and therefore, claim 16 is not anticipated by Park.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 5, 7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park. This rejection is based on the same incorrect interpretation of Park on which the rejections under §102 are based. Thus, for at least the same reasons discussed above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11-15 and 17-21 are allowed.


Claims 23-24 are objected to, but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. In view of the above remarks, however, the underlying base claims are allowable, and claims 23-24 should be allowable in their current form.

***Conclusion***

Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph S. Makuch  
Reg. No. 39,286

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-222-3613  
**Customer No. 20575**